DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 361 124 PS 021 801

TITLE	National Education Commission on Time and Learning Annual Report, Fiscal Year 1992.
INSTITUTION	National Education Commission on Time and Learning, Washington, DC.
PUB DATE	31 Mar 93
NOTE	30p.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Descriptive (141) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Annual Reports; *Educational Change; *Educational Improvement; Elementary Secondary Education; *Extended School Day; *Extended School Year; Federal Legislation; Questionnaires; *Time Factors (Learning)
IDENTIFIERS	*National Education Commission on Time and Learning

ABSTRACT

This report describes the work of the National Education Commission on Time and Learning, created by Congress in June 1991 to examine the quality and adequacy of the time American students spend on study and learning. The report provides biographical profiles of the nine Commission members and outlines the topics that have been or will be addressed in public hearings. Through hearings, school visits, research papers, reports, and consultations with various individuals in the education community, the Committee has amassed a wealth of information on time and learning issues. Thirty-two findings and observations gleaned from these sources are presented. These findings and observations address the following areas: (1) time and the school reform movement; (2) time for student learning; (3) time for teachers; (4) out-of-school time and youth employment; (5) parent and community involvement; (6) student motivation; (7) international comparisons; and (8) promising practices. Also included is a list of 16 questions, compiled by the commissioners themselves, to assist in preparing their final report and recommendations, to be issued in April 1994. Three appendices provide the business addresses and telephone numbers of the commissioners; a list of the Commission hearings, meetings, and site visits; and a copy of a nine-question survey that was widely distributed to associations and computer networks. (MDM)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

PS

ED 361 124

NATIONAL EDUCATION COMMISSION ON TIME AND LEARNING

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

JOHN HODGE JONES
CHAIRMAN
MURFREESBORO, TN

CAROL SCHWARTZ
VICE CHAIRMAN
WASHINGTON, DC

MICHAEL J. BARRETT
CAMBRIDGE, MA

B. MARIE BYERS
HAGERSTOWN, MD

CHRISTOPHER T. CROSS
CHEVY CHASE, MD

DENIS P. DOYLE
CHEVY CHASE, MD

NORMAN E. HIGGINS
DOVER-FOXCROFT, ME

WILLIAM E. SHELTON
YPSILANTI, MI

GLENN R. WALKER
CLYDE, KS

MILTON GOLDBERG
EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

JULIA A. ANDERSON
DEPUTY EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

Annual Report

Fiscal Year 1992

March 31, 1993
Washington, DC

PS 021801

1255 22ND ST. NW SUITE 502 WASHINGTON, DC 20202-7591 (202)•653•5019

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

March 31, 1993

Dear Reader:

On behalf of the National Education Commission on Time and Learning, I am pleased to submit our Fiscal Year 1992 Annual Report. The Commission has prepared this report in accordance with Sec. 443 (a) (2) of the General Education Provisions Act.

I am happy to report that the Commission on Time and Learning has enjoyed a very productive first year. Our activities over the past year have only reinforced our belief in the importance of the Commission's mandate and the very real potential of its final report to fundamentally alter the course of education reform in this country.

The Nation appears to be nearing consensus on the need for radical reform, even revolution, in America's schools. This national commitment to improving the U.S. educational system is to be applauded. It is our firm belief, however, that true and lasting change will not occur unless, and until, time and learning issues are addressed in a serious and sustained manner.

The amount of quality instructional time students spend in our schools affects educational achievement in a very direct way. Time is a crucial resource in education — and a malleable one at that. It can be structured and utilized in a variety of ways, and, in distinct contrast to other variables in the education equation — such as socioeconomic background and family life — time in school is a resource that can be directly managed by educators and communities.

Time as an educational variable, however, has yet to adequately capture the attention of those seeking to improve American education. We therefore envision our final report, to be issued in April of 1994, as a challenge to the education community to accord time its rightful place in conversations about reform. Using time as the lens, or prism, through which to view educational issues, we intend to offer a fresh perspective on a number of key debates, and, drawing our inspiration from the many creative grassroots programs we have seen around the country, to suggest a number of innovative solutions to ongoing problems.

You will note that the attached report covers a period of time extending beyond the end of fiscal year 1992 by several months. Given that the Commission began its work in April of 1992, we feel that this expanded time frame is justified. Only a report which includes our activities of last fall and winter can provide you with a fully representative account of our progress.

During the coming year, the Commission will continue the arduous but instructive process of consultation it has begun, inviting a broad range of practitioners, researchers, and policy makers to speak on issues related to time and learning, and reaching out to communities across the country for new insights and innovative ideas. We will also continue to shape the conceptual framework that will guide our final report. The Commissioners anticipate another busy but rewarding year, and we look forward to submitting our final report to you in April of 1994.

Thank you for your interest in the Commission's progress.

Sincerely,

John H. Jones

John Hodge Jones
Chairman

Table of Contents

Our Children's Education: A Growing Concern 1

From Issue to Initiative: Creation of the National Education Commission on Time and Learning 2

Purpose and Functions of the Commission 2

Commission Membership 3

Commission Staff 5

Commission Hearings and Meetings 5

Other Activities 6

Witness Findings and Observations 6

Commissioner Questions 10

Acknowledgements 12

APPENDICES

Appendix 1 - Business Addresses of the Commissioners 14

Appendix 2 - List of Commission Hearings and Meetings and Site visits 16

Appendix 3 - Survey Questionaire 24

Our Children's Education: A Growing Concern

In the last decade, our nation has watched as young people from other countries outpace our own in scholastic achievement. At the same time, we have heard from business and industry about a decline in the academic skills needed to keep our nation technologically and economically competitive.

The 1983 report by the National Commission on Excellence in Education, *A Nation At Risk*, found that students in the United States lag behind their international counterparts in testing and achievement rates — in part because they spend less time on learning. Based on the evidence presented to it, the Commission concluded that American students spent much less time on school work than their counterparts in other nations and that the time U.S. students do spend in the classroom and on homework is often used ineffectively.

The National Commission on Excellence expressed particular concern over the fact that in the United States, the typical school day was six hours long and the typical school year, 175 to 180 days, while in many other industrialized countries the day lasts eight hours and the year, 220 days. That Commission recommended that school districts and state legislatures consider seven-hour school days and 200- to 220-day school years.

Ten years later, remarkably little has changed. While state legislatures mandate minimum standards for time in school, localities continue to accept these numbers as the de facto maximum. The 180-day school year remains the magic barrier beyond which states appear unwilling to venture.

The time American students allocate to homework also remains very low by international standards. As a result, American students devote considerably less time to academic learning than do their counterparts in other industrialized countries. In fact, a 1991 study found that U.S. high school students spend only half as much time per week engaged in academic work as do their Japanese counterparts (Juster and Stafford, *The Allocation of Time: Empirical Findings, Behavioral Models, and Problems of Measurement*, Journal of Economic Literature, June 1991).

This ongoing lack of attention to time and learning issues is a matter of considerable concern, for the reform movement would surely benefit from the insights a serious examination of time would yield. Time is a crucial resource in education — and a malleable one at that. It can be structured and utilized in a variety of ways, and, in distinct contrast to other variables in the education equation — such as socioeconomic background and family life — time in and out of school is a resource that can be managed by educators and communities.

From Issue to Initiative: Creation of the National Education Commission on Time and Learning

Responding to the need for a sustained examination of time and learning issues, the U.S. Congress, on January 30, 1991, proposed legislation to establish a commission to study the feasibility of lengthening the public school day and year in the United States.

On June 27, 1991, Public Law 102-62, The Education Council Act of 1991, was signed by the President, creating the National Education Commission on Time and Learning.

Purpose and Functions of the Commission

The National Education Commission on Time and Learning is charged with examining the quality and adequacy of the time U.S. students spend on study and learning.

To carry out this mission, the Commission is holding public hearings and meetings in urban, suburban, and rural areas across the nation in order to receive the reports, views, and analyses of a broad spectrum of experts as well as the general public. The Commissioners, individually and as a group, are also making site visits to schools around the country that are experimenting with new ways to use time. In addition, the Commission is collecting and analyzing data, research, and responses to questionnaires.

The Commission has been asked to organize its findings and recommendations in the form of a final report to the U.S. Congress and the Secretary of the U.S. Department of Education. This report will be released in April of 1994.

Public Law 102-62 requires that the Commission's final report include an analysis and recommendations concerning:

- the length of the academic day and the academic year in elementary and secondary schools throughout the United States and in schools of other nations;
- the time children spend in school learning academic subjects such as English, mathematics, science, history and geography;
- the use of incentives for students to increase their educational achievement in available instruction time;
- how children spend their time outside school with particular attention to how much of that time can be considered "learning time" and how out-of-school activities affect intellectual development;
- the time children spend on homework, how much of that time is spent on academic subjects, the importance that parents and teachers attach to homework, and the extent to which homework contributes to student learning;

- year-round professional opportunities for teachers and how teachers can use their time to acquire knowledge and skills that will permit them to improve their performance and help raise the status of the profession;

- how school facilities are used for extended learning programs;

- the appropriate number of hours per day and days per year of instruction for United States public elementary and secondary schools;

- if appropriate, a model plan for adopting a longer academic day and academic year for use by United States elementary and secondary schools by the end of this decade, including recommendations regarding mechanisms to assist states, school districts, schools, and parents in making the transition from the current academic day and year to an academic day and year of a longer duration;

- suggestions for such changes in laws and regulations as may be required to facilitate states, school districts, and schools in adopting longer academic days and years; and

- an analysis and estimate of the additional costs, including the cost of increased teacher compensation, to states and local school districts if longer academic days and years are adopted.

Commission Membership

The nine members of the National Education Commission on Time and Learning were appointed on the basis of their education, training and experience according to guidelines presented in the legislation. Three Commissioners were appointed by the President Pro Tempore of the Senate on recommendations of the majority and minority leaders, three by the Speaker of the House of Representatives in consultation with the minority leader, and three by the U.S. Secretary of Education.

The National Education Commission on Time and Learning began its work in April 1992. Commission Chairman John Hodge Jones and Vice Chairman Carol Schwartz were elected by the Commission from among its membership. Members of the Commission are as follows:

John Hodge Jones, Murfreesboro, Tennessee — Jones is Commission Chairman and School Superintendent in Murfreesboro, Tennessee. Under his leadership, the school system has implemented a nationally recognized extended day/year program.

Carol Schwartz, Washington, District of Columbia — Vice Chairman Schwartz has served on the District of Columbia Board of Education and City Council. She has been a special education teacher and a consultant to the U.S. Department of Education.

Michael J. Barrett, Cambridge, Massachusetts — Barrett represents four communities in the Massachusetts State Senate. His 1990 cover story in the *Atlantic* magazine helped spark a national debate on extending the American school year.

B. Marie Byers, Hagerstown, Maryland — A former teacher, Byers is an advocate for quality life-long learning. She is currently President of the Washington County School Board. In 1990-91 she was President of the Maryland Association of Boards of Education.

Christopher T. Cross, Chevy Chase, Maryland — Cross is Executive Director of the Education Initiative of The Business Roundtable. He is a former Assistant Secretary for Educational Research and Improvement in the U.S. Department of Education.

Denis P. Doyle, Chevy Chase, Maryland — Doyle is a Senior Fellow at the Hudson Institute and was formerly with the American Enterprise Institute. He has written extensively about education policy and school reform.

Norman E. Higgins, Dover-Foxcroft, Maine — A former teacher, Higgins is Principal of Piscataquis Community High School. He has served on Maine's Common Core of Learning Commission and in 1988, earned a National Alliance for the Arts Leadership Award.

William E. Shelton, Ypsilanti, Michigan — A former teacher and principal, Shelton is President of Eastern Michigan University. He is active in local and national organizations and has written on higher education issues.

Glenn R. Walker, Clyde, Kansas — Walker is a former teacher and Fulbright Fellow. He is Principal of Clifton-Clyde High School. From 1987-1991 Walker was State Chairman of the "Initiative for Understanding: US-USSR Youth Exchange."

The current business addresses of the Commissioners are included as Appendix 1.

Commission Staff

In July 1992, the Commission appointed Milton Goldberg as its Executive Director. A former teacher and school administrator, Dr. Goldberg has served as Director of the Office of Research, Director of Programs for the Improvement of Practice and Acting Director of the National Institute of Education in the U.S. Department of Education. He was also the Executive Director of the National Commission on Excellence in Education, which produced the landmark report *A Nation At Risk*.

Dr. Goldberg heads a small staff charged with organizing Commission activities, overseeing the budget, collecting and synthesizing pertinent data and research, and handling dissemination and public relations.

Ms. Julia Anna Anderson is the Commission's Deputy Executive Director. Dr. Cheryl Kane serves as the Research Coordinator. Dr. Frederick Edelstein is a Senior Associate responsible for enhancing collaboration between the Commission and the business community. Ms. Anita Madan Renton serves as a Research Associate, and Ms. Emma Madison Jordan is the Commission's Administrative Officer.

Ms. Debra Hollinger of the U.S. Department of Education serves as the Commission's Designated Federal Official (DFO).

Commission Hearings and Meetings

The Commission has held four public hearings and five meetings to date. The dates and locations of these events, as well as a list of all witnesses who presented testimony, are included as Appendix 2.

The Commission's out-of-town public hearings generally last two days. The first day is devoted to school site visits and a local hearing; on the second day, the Commission hears from national experts on research related to key issues before it.

In its first two public hearings — the first held in Washington, DC on June 26, 1992 and the second in Murfreesboro, Tennessee on October 22-23, 1992 — the Commission sought to establish the parameters of its investigation by consulting with a diverse group of researchers, practitioners, policy makers, and education organizations on the adequacy of the time presently devoted to learning. While these individuals presented a broad range of perspectives, the Commission perceived a significant degree of consensus in the education community regarding the pressing need to improve the efficiency of the present school day and year while also giving serious consideration to alternative conceptions of time use, including a longer day and year.

Having in this way established the broad parameters of its work, the Commission has chosen to focus the remainder of its hearings on specific issues included within its mandate. These hearings include: Student Learning and Motivation (January 14-15, 1993 in Albuquerque, New Mexico), Costs of Time Allocations (March 25-26, 1993 in Santa Monica, California),

Teacher Professional Development (April 29-30, 1993 in Ypsilanti, Michigan), Out of School Time (June 17-18, 1993 in Kansas), and International Comparisons (October 14-15, 1993 in Boston, Massachusetts).

The Commission's business meetings are devoted to discussion among the Commissioners of the direction and progress of their work, their findings, and various administrative issues. Occasionally, expert witnesses are invited to address the Commission during these meetings. From time to time, the Commission also schedules school site visits to coincide with its business meetings.

Other Activities

In addition to holding public hearings and convening meetings, Commission members and staff have made presentations at numerous professional conferences and association meetings. These meetings permit the Commission not only to describe its purpose and activities but also to elicit the input of various audiences. Commissioners and staff also have visited schools with innovative programs in the area of time use and reported their findings to their colleagues.

The Commission is accumulating a substantial number of written materials in the course of its investigation. All witnesses, for example, are asked to submit written outlines of their key points, and these documents become part of the Commission's records. The Commission itself prepares summaries of all hearings and makes these available to the public. In addition, Commission staff gather and synthesize research papers and statistical data for use by the Commissioners in their deliberations. These materials are provided to the Commissioners through periodic mailings.

In its efforts to gather information on time and learning issues, the Commission has contacted many individuals and organizations in the education community. The materials gleaned from these sources, whether in the form of research papers, reports, or conversations, are also part of the Commission's records.

Because it believes in the importance of receiving the views of a broad range of participants in the education community, the Commission has developed a survey questionnaire which is being widely distributed through direct mailings to associations and computer networks such as that linking the Regional Education Laboratories. A copy of this survey questionnaire is included as Appendix 3.

Witness Findings and Observations

During its first year, the Commission has amassed a wealth of information on time and learning issues. The following findings and observations are intended to provide a flavor of the richness and diversity of the material the Commission is receiving from witnesses at its hearings and meetings.

While many other important ideas and suggestions offered to the Commission do not appear in this report, they will, of course, be considered by the Commission as it prepares its final report. As noted above is this list is not meant to be comprehensive.

It should be noted that the following findings and observations have not been endorsed by the Commissioners as a group.

Time and the Reform Movement

- Time deserves a place at the center of all strategic thinking about improving how we educate our children. The reform movement has thus far devoted too little attention to issues of time and learning.

- The emergence of curriculum frameworks, new assessments, and standards for all students should force us to consider reconfiguring basic time structures.

- The United States needs to make much more efficient use of school time, even within the present structures of the day and year. There are currently far too many distractions and far too much wasted time and energy. Too much instructional time is sacrificed to non-teaching duties and non-academic mandates.

- Demographic data that reveal changes in such basic societal characteristics as family structure, the number of single parent families, and the number of working parents must be considered in any attempt to reconfigure school time.

Time for Student Learning

- Student learning outcomes must be the "engines of reform." Time requirements must match our expectations for student performance.

- We must increase both the quantity and the quality of the time students spend studying and learning.

- Students must have time to think, to formulate questions, to construct explanations and arguments, and to practice their skills.

- American students spend more time engaged in seatwork than do Asian students.

- In allocating time for learning, we must respect the different learning rates of students.

- At-risk students are in particular need of continuous, extended educational opportunities.

- For students of limited English proficiency, formal language instruction is best offered on a continuous basis, uninterrupted by a long break.

- We must improve summer programs which provide remediation, enrichment, and acceleration opportunities.

Time for Teachers

- Student time and teacher time must be restructured concurrently.

- Teachers must have time to prepare, organize, reflect, interact with their colleagues, and engage in the collaborative development of curriculum and assessment practices.

- American teachers spend much less time providing direct instruction to their students than do their Asian counterparts.

Out-of-School Time and Youth Employment

- We must construct stronger relationships between what students do in school and their out-of-school activities.

- In some industries, such as theme and amusement parks, young people form the bulk of the staff.

- National surveys indicate that approximately two-thirds of all high school juniors and seniors hold jobs in the formal part-time labor force at any specific time during the school year, and that over half of all employed U.S. high school seniors work more than 20 hours per week.

Parent and Community Involvement

- Parents must reinforce school learning for their children.

- Businesses and communities must play a greater role in supporting student learning, particularly during the time that children spend out of school.

- School facilities could serve not only as a place for learning and studying but also as a locus for the provision of health, recreation, and other services by a number of community agencies.

- Public-private partnerships should be expanded in order to provide additional learning experiences, particularly for secondary school students.

Student Motivation

- Research on student motivation has shown that students improve their work most when they are taught to attribute failure to lack of effort rather than low ability.
- Students must come to appreciate that learning takes work.
- Teachers sometimes indirectly and unintentionally communicate a belief in students lack of ability to succeed in learning through such practices as excessive praise, unsolicited offers of help, and sympathetic affect.

International Comparisons

- In making international comparisons, we must note not only the time allocated to schooling but also the priority given by parents and the society at large to education.
- It is important to understand how the additional time allocated to schooling in Asian countries is actually used, and how the school day is structured to maximize learning.
- Approximately 25 hours per week is spent on task in American Classrooms compared to about 38 hours a week in Japan.

Promising Practices

- We should support pilot projects which explore innovative ways to provide more time for learning, including an extended school day and year.
- Extended school programs, now in place, such as those that operate from 6 am to 6 pm year-round, address the following concerns:

  - parents' interest in their children's well-being
  - the efficient utilization of school facilities and other resources
  - business interest in having employees focus their attention on productivity rather than worrying about the safety of their children
  - the need for more quality instructional time and enrichment opportunities
  - the use of the school building as a locus for the provision of services by a number of community agencies

  It is possible to finance extended school programs through a combination of parent fees, creative staffing, and Chapter I funds.

- Adherents of year-round schooling, both single-track and multi-track, claim a number of benefits, including financial savings, reduced summer learning loss, and compensation for the negative effects of student mobility. Year-round school systems reorganize the school year so as to provide more continuous instruction and to reduce, although not eliminate, summer vacation.

- Technology should play a key role in school restructuring, in reducing the administrative burden on teachers, and in helping children to learn "smarter" as well as "faster."

Commissioner Questions

The Commissioners have formulated a number of broad questions to assist them in reviewing the information gleaned from hearings, meetings, and site visits as well as from the scholarly literature on time and learning. Among these questions are the following:

Political, Economic, and Social Context

- How do variations in law and regulation related to time, curriculum, and school funding affect alternative uses of time in school for learning?

- What are the projected costs of increasing the school day or year within the current framework of school organization and practices? Are there economies of scale to be achieved?

- Do the changing needs of students and parents suggest accompanying changes in the functions of schools? What do students and their families now need from schools that was not required in the past?

School Organization

- Should the length of the school day and year be the same for all students? Should different amounts of time be made available to different students?

- How are classrooms and schools best organized and managed so as to maximize learning time and student outcomes?

- In extended year programs, is the same level of instruction provided to students in the summer months as during the regular school year? Is student performance affected when outside teachers, as opposed to the students' regular classroom teachers, are employed for the summer session?

- What promising practices are emerging regarding the use of time for learning (e.g. varieties of block scheduling, students remaining with one teacher for two or more years, students completing work for a particular grade other than at the end of the school year)?

Student Motivation and Incentives

- What incentives are used in schools to enhance student motivation and boost student achievement?

- What is known about the effects of current teaching practices on student motivation and student outcomes? Have some practices been shown to increase student interest and learning?

Teachers

- What knowledge and skills are required by teachers if they are to participate in improving their schools (e.g. planning, monitoring of practices, consultation with colleagues)? To what degree is there congruence between the nature of current professional development and the type of knowledge and skills teachers need in order to improve student learning, particularly in the context of new standards, curricula, and assessments?

Out-of-School Activities

- What can schools do to enhance parental roles and responsibilities with regard to homework?

- How do out-of-school learning activities affect student outcomes? Which activities seem most effective in promoting desired outcomes?

- How much time do students spend engaged in activities outside of school which may distract them from academic learning (e.g. television viewing, dating, working)?

Lifelong Learning

- What types of skills and attitudes are required for lifelong learning?

Technology

- What effective strategies exist for using technology to promote student learning, including mastery of basic skills, higher order thinking skills, and personal traits such as the ability to work cooperatively with others?

Facilities

- What are the financial implications of expanding or altering the use of school facilities?

Acknowledgments

The National Education Commission on Time and Learning gratefully acknowledges the support and assistance of the many individuals and associations whose generosity helped to make this year a successful one for us.

The National Education Commission on Time and Learning extends its thanks to the following individuals and organizations, in particular, for supporting our public hearings:

South Central Bell, Nashville, Tennessee

Washington Marriott Hotel, Washington, DC

Sunwest Bank, Albuquerque, New Mexico

W.H. Hume, San Francisco, California

Baxter Healthcare Corporation, Deerfield, Illinois

Murfreesboro City Schools, Murfreesboro, Tennessee

Albuquerque Public Schools, New Mexico

Santa Monica Unified School District, California

Beacon Day and High School, Oakland, California

We also wish to thank those offices and individuals within the U.S. Department of Education upon whose support and assistance we have relied on a continuing basis. Thanks are due as well to those in both the executive and the legislative branches who have shown sincere and sustained interest in the work of the Commission.

In addition, the Commission wishes to thank the many associations which have assisted us in soliciting the views of their membership regarding the issues before us. We extend our thanks also to the many practitioners, researchers, and other interested individuals who have taken the time to share their ideas with us in writing, including through our survey questionnaire. These comments are being given serious consideration and will contribute in a very real way to the Commission's deliberations.

APPENDICES

BUSINESS ADDRESSES OF THE COMMISSIONERS

Honorable Michael J. Barrett
State Senator
Commonwealth of Massachusetts
The State House — Room 405
Boston, MA 02133
(617) 722-1280 Business
(617) 722-2897 Fax

Mrs. B. Marie Byers
President
Washington County Board
of Education
242 Potomac Heights
Hagerstown, MD 21742
(301) 791-4104 Business
(301) 791-9471 Fax

Mr. Christopher T. Cross
Executive Director
Education Initiative
The Business Roundtable
1615 L Street, NW Suite 1350
Washington, DC 20036
(202) 872-1260 Business
(202) 466-3509 Fax

Mr. Denis P. Doyle
Senior Fellow
Hudson Institute
110 Summerfield Rd.
Chevy Chase, MD 20815
(301) 986-9350 Business
(301) 907-4959 Fax

Mr. Norman E. Higgins, Jr.
Principal
Piscataquis Community High School
P.O. Box 118
Guilford, ME 04443
(207) 876-4625 Business
(207) 876-4264 Fax

Dr. John Hodge Jones
Superintendent
Murfreesboro City Schools
400 N. Maple St.
Murfreesboro, TN 37130
(615) 893-2313 Business
(615) 893-2352 Fax

Mrs. Carol Schwartz
Community and Charitable
Activities Volunteer
3555 Springland Lane, NW
Washington, DC 20008
(202) 244-4127 Business

Dr. William E. Shelton
President
Eastern Michigan University
202 Welch Hall
Ypsilanti, MI 48197
(313) 487-2211 Business
(313) 487-9100 Fax

Mr. Glenn R. Walker
Principal
Clifton-Clyde High School
616 N. High Street
Clyde, KS 66938
(913) 446-3444 Business

LIST OF COMMISSION HEARINGS AND MEETINGS

The Commission held the following meetings and hearings. Listed below are the dates and presenters who testified before the Commission. In addition to invited presenters, the Commission provided an opportunity for the public to testify at each hearing.

First Meeting: April 13, 1992
Washington, DC

Open

Second Meeting: May 15, 1992
Washington, DC

Morning Session Closed; Afternoon Session Open

Third Meeting: June 25, 1992
Washington, DC

Open

First Hearing: June 26, 1992
Washington, DC

Mr. Gordon Ambach
Executive Director
Council of Chief State School Officers

Mr. R. S. Archibald
President, National Association for Year Round Education
Superintendent of Schools, Marion County, Florida

Ms. Lillian Brinkley
President
National Association of Elementary School Principals

Mr. James Dyke
Secretary of Education
Commonwealth of Virginia

Dr. Jeanne Griffith
Associate Commissioner for Data Development
National Center for Education Statistics
U.S. Department of Education

Mr. R. David Hall
President and Ward 2 Representative
District of Columbia School Board

Dr. Nancy Mead
Director
International Assessment of Educational Progress
Educational Testing Service

Dr. Harold Stevenson
Professor of Developmental Psychology
University of Michigan

Mr. Bruce Walborn
Member
International Association of Amusement Parks and Attractions

Fourth Meeting: September 24, 1992
Washington, DC

Open

Dr. Joyce Epstein
Co-Director
Center on Families, Communities, Schools,
and Children's Learning
The Johns Hopkins University

Dr. Robert Spillane
Division Superintendent
Fairfax County Public Schools

Mr. Gene Wilhoit
Executive Director
National Association of State Boards of Education

Second Hearing: October 22-23, 1992
Murfreesboro, Tennessee

October 22, 1992 Local Hearing

Ms. Beth Atkins
Extension Agent, Urban 4-H
University of Tennessee Agricultural Extension Service

Mr. Jerry Benefield
President and CEO
Nissan Motor Manufacturing Corp., USA
Smyrna, Tennessee

Ms. Becci Bookner
Director
Extended School Program and Community Education
Murfreesboro, Tennessee

Ms. Sue Bordine
Assistant Principal
Mitchell-Neilson Elementary School
Murfreesboro, Tennessee

Ms. Beth Callaway
League of Women Voters
Murfreesboro, Tennessee

Mr. Joel Jobe
Managing Partner
Jobe, Turley, and Associates
Murfreesboro, Tennessee

Ms. Monica Lewis
Director, Extended School
Bedford County Board of Education
Bedford County, Tennessee

Ms. Wendy Day Rowell
ESP Parent
Mitchell-Neilson Elementary School

Mr. Ralph Vaughn
Executive Director
Rutherford/Murfreesboro Chamber of Commerce

Dr. Jane Williams
Director, Professional Laboratory Experiences
Middle Tennessee State University
Murfreesboro, Tennessee

October 23, 1992 Regional Hearing

Dr. Richard Benjamin
Director of Schools
Metropolitan-Nashville Public Schools
Nashville, Tennessee

Mr. David Brittain
Bureau Chief, Bureau of Education Technology
Florida Department of Education
Tallahassee, Florida

Dr. Carolyn Evertson
Chair, Department of Teaching and Learning
Vanderbilt University
Nashville, Tennessee

Dr. Russell L. French
Bureau of Educational Research and Service
University of Tennessee
Knoxville, Tennessee

Dr. Bill Hawley
Director, Center for Educational Policy
Vanderbilt Institute of Public Policy Studies
Nashville, Tennessee

Mr. Gary Middleton
Deputy Regional Vice President
State Farm Insurance Company
South Central Region

Mr. William Page
President, Insignia Financial Group, Inc.
Greenville, South Carolina

Ms. Gail Walker
Kindergarten Teacher
Konnoak Elementary School
Winston-Salem, North Carolina

Dr. Elaine Willers
Director, Tennessee Academy for School Leaders
Tennessee State Department of Education
Nashville, Tennessee

Fifth Meeting: December 10, 1992
Washington, DC

Open

Dr. Sara Huyvaert
Professor
Eastern Michigan University

Third Hearing: January 14-15, 1993
Albuquerque, New Mexico

January 14, 1993 Local Hearing

Mr. Tom Burnett
Director
Christopher Columbus Consortium
Apple Computer

Ms. Cindy Chapman
Teacher
Longfellow Elementary School

Mr. Don Davidson
Vice President
Jostens Learning Corporation

Ms. Geraldine Harge
Assistant Superintendent
Albuquerque Public Schools

Mr. Kurt Steinhaus
Director of Education Planning
and Technology
New Mexico State Department of Education

Ms. Virginia Trujillo
President
New Mexico State Board of Education

Dr. Polly Turner
Assistant Dean of Education
University of New Mexico

January 15, 1993 Hearing on Student Learning and Motivation

Dr. Sandra Graham
Graduate School of Education
University of California at Los Angeles
Los Angeles, California

Dr. James Greeno
School of Education
Stanford University
Stanford, California

Dr. Amado Padilla
School of Education
Stanford University
Stanford, California

Ms. Susanna Purnell
RAND Corporation
Santa Monica, California

Fourth Hearing: March 25-26, 1993
Santa Monica, California

March 25, 1993 Local Hearing

Dr. Neil Schmidt
Superintendent
Santa Monica Unified Public Schools
Santa Monica, CA

Dr. Norman Brekke
Superintendent
Oxnard Public School District
Oxnard, CA

Dr. Jane Zykowski
Principal Investigator
Year Round Education Project
UC Riverside
Riverside, CA

Ms. Leslie Medine
Co-Founder
Beacon Day School
Oakland, CA

Ms. Michelle Swanson
Teacher
Sir Francis Drake High School
San Anselmo, CA

March 26, 1993 Hearing on the Costs of Various Time Allocations

Dr. Sharon Conley
Professor
College of Education
University of Arizona
Tucson, Arizona

Dr. Stephen Heyneman
Chief, Human Resources Division
The World Bank
Washington, DC

Dr. Jacquelyn McCroskey
Professor
School of Social Work
University of Southern California
Los Angeles, California

Dr. Larry Picus
Associate Director
Center for Research in Education Finance
University of Southern California
Los Angeles, California

SITE VISITS

In addition to the hearings and business meetings, the Commissioners have observed each of the following Schools that have implemented alternative uses of time for learning:

Beacon Day and High School
Oakland, California

Carl Sandburg Intermediate School
Alexandria, Virginia

Emerson Elementary School
Albuquerque, New Mexico

Governor Bent Elementary School
Albuquerque, New Mexico

James A. Foshay Middle School
Los Angeles, California

Mooresville School District
Charlotte, North Carolina

Parry McCluer High School
Buena Vista, Virginia

Sir Francis Drake High School
San Anselmo, California

SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRE

How Can We Enhance the Use of Time for Learning?

The National Education Commission on Time and Learning

The National Education Commission on Time and Learning is charged with examining the quality and adequacy of the time U.S. students spend on study and learning. In carrying out its mandate, the Commission is considering: the length of the school day and year; how time is used for learning academic subjects; the use of incentives to increase student achievement in available instructional time; how children spend their time outside school, including time spent on homework; year-round professional opportunities for teachers; how states might change their rules and regulations to facilitate a longer day and year; an analysis and estimate of costs associated with more time in school; and, the use of school facilities for extended learning programs.

Why the Commission Is Important to You

Educators should be particularly interested in and supportive of the efforts of the National Education Commission on Time and Learning. You and your colleagues have surely had many discussions regarding the improved use of time for student learning. Our Commission is convinced that your leadership can help to create new conceptions of learning time which serve not only students but also families and communities. In addition, these conceptions should allow teachers and principals the time necessary for planning, organization, and professional development.

Your Assistance Is Requested

We encourage you to communicate with the Commission by sending your written ideas and suggestions or by responding to the following questions:

1. Do you favor children receiving more opportunities to learn in grades 1-12 via a longer school day or year?

a. A longer day?

b. A longer year?

c. Both?

d. Other? Please specify briefly

2. Would you be willing to pay for additional learning time for those students whose needs and learning styles require it?

3. How could school buildings be used more extensively to meet the changing needs of students and their families?

4. What can be done to increase student motivation to learn?

5. If you could make one recommendation about how children spend their time outside of school, what would it be?

6. How could homework be used more effectively to improve student learning?

7. How should the school provide the time needed for teachers to improve their knowledge and skills during the day and during the year?

8. What is your role as an educator?

9. In what type of schooling environment do you work — public, private, home-schooling?

Please address your responses to our office:

Milton Goldberg, Executive Director
National Education Commission
on Time and Learning
1255 22nd Street, N.W., Suite 502
Washington, DC 20202-7591

Tel: (202) 653-5019

We look forward to hearing from you.